

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's continued allowance of claims 2-6 and 9-14.

Claims 7, 15-16, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,552) in view of Karasaki (JP 11-167108) and Meisner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,642). In response, although Applicants believe that there is no motivation to modify Whitcher as suggested by the Examiner, Applicants further amended independent claim 7 to expedite prosecution and now define the display panel as a “flat” display panel, and include a circuit board located behind the panel-shaped module component. The circuit board includes a display controller for controlling display on the screen, and Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as it applies to amended claim 7 and its dependent claims 15 and 19.

In the Office Action on page 2, under item 3, second paragraph, the Examiner asserts that Whitcher has a display panel module comprising a liquid crystal display panel 75 defining a screen. However, Whitcher fails to show a circuit board located behind a panel-shaped module component, wherein the circuit board includes a display controller for controlling display on the screen on a flat display panel, as now recited in amended claim 7.

Karasaki is merely cited for disclosing a display panel module that has a liquid crystal display panel comprising a bevel and having a flat plate frame. Meisner is merely cited for disclosing a display panel module comprising a liquid crystal display

panel and an electrically insulating bezel. Neither Karasaki nor Meisner overcome the deficiencies of Whitcher, which includes providing a circuit board behind the panel-shaped module component that includes a display controller. For this reason, withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 7 and its dependent claims 15 and 19 is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 16 and 20, Applicants traverse the rejection because there is no motivation to combine Whitcher and Meisner.

The present invention overcomes a phenomenon of a “loop antenna” in a bezel and a liquid crystal display panel module or the like. This phenomenon is not disclosed or taught in the cited prior art references, and results from the resonance of electromagnetic waves acting on the bezel. The electromagnetic waves radiate from a controller circuit controlling display in the liquid crystal display panel module. Since the cited prior art references are silent regarding this “loop antenna” phenomenon, the cited prior art references cannot provide any motivation for molding an insulating material into a bezel to suppress radiation of electromagnetic waves.

It is a well-known objective in the art to minimize a size of an electronic apparatus. Accordingly, a common goal is to provide a bezel that is thinner than existing bezels. Under such circumstances, one skilled in the art would prefer a metallic material for a bezel instead of a resin material because a metallic material can be formed thinner than a resin material without deteriorating the strength of the bezel. Accordingly, one

skilled in the art would not be motivated to use an insulating resin material without understanding the phenomenon of a “loop antenna.”

With respect to Meisner, the Examiner considers the “electric shock hazard” for substituting Whitcher’s rigid plastic bezel with an electrically insulating bezel. However, electric shock is caused by a direct supply of electric current to a bezel. In other words, a power supply must directly contact the bezel so as to cause an electric shock.

The present invention, however, relates to radiation of electromagnetic waves from a controller circuit for a display. A controller circuit for a display, however, does not directly supply electric current to the bezel when the bezel experiences radiation from electromagnetic waves. The controller circuit for a display is not required to contact the bezel. Thus, there is no need or motivation to substitute the rigid plastic bezel of Whitcher with a bezel that prevents electric shock. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to modify Whitcher, contrary to the assertions of the Examiner.

The Examiner further asserts that Meisner suggests substitution of a CRT display with a liquid crystal display. However, when a CRT display is replaced with a liquid crystal display, the liquid crystal display must function to display images in the same manner as the CRT display. The liquid crystal display must be included as a complete full assembly. Therefore, the liquid crystal display panel and other panel-shaped module components must be assembled into a complete and full assembly before

they are placed between the bezel frame 21 and the rear shell 29. Under such circumstances, a bezel must exist, in addition to a bezel frame 21 and a rear shell 29 so as to hold the liquid crystal display panel and the other panel-shaped module components together. Meisner fails to disclose having a bezel of this type. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the “bezel frame” of Meisner cannot be equivalent to the bezel recited in the claims of the present application. For these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to modify Whitcher based on the teachings of Meisner, and therefore the rejection of claim 16 and its respective dependent claim 20 should be withdrawn, which is respectfully requested.

Claims 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher in view of Howell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,531) and Meisner. Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the §103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 16.

Howell is cited by the Examiner as disclosing in FIGs. 2 and 4 an electronic apparatus that includes a housing and a display panel module incorporated within the housing. Howell does not overcome the deficiencies recited above with respect to the Whitcher and Meisner references, and therefore Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103 rejection as it applies to amended claims 17 and 21.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher in view of Karasaki and Meisner, and further in view of Mishima et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0033265) or Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,993,027).

Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 7.

Since claim 18 depends upon claim 7, it necessarily includes all the features of its associated independent claim plus other additional features. Thus, Applicants submit that the §103 rejections of claim 18 have also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 7, and also because Mishima and Yamamoto fail to overcome the deficiencies of the Whitcher, Karasaki, and Meisner references. Applicants respectfully request that §103 rejections of claim 18 also be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By


Joseph P. Fox
Registration No. 41,760

October 9, 2006
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978